FILE: B-220282

DATE: September 27, 1985

MATTER OF:

Triple A Shipyards

DIGEST:

Where a bidder enters a bid price for every item on the bid schedule, the bidder has offered to perform as required under the solicitation and at a price determinable from the face of the bid. Accordingly, the bidder's failure to enter a total price did not render the bid nonresponsive and, instead, may be considered an informality and waived.

Triple A Shipyards (Triple A) has protested award to Pacific Dry Dock and Repair Co. under invitation for bids (IFB) No. 8140-85-B-0042 issued by the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, for drydocking of the historic square rigged sailing ship BALCLUTHA. The protest is dismissed. We do so without having received a report from the contracting agency since it is clear from its face that the protest is without merit. 4 C.F.R. § 21.3(f) (1985).

Triple A advises that the IFB was issued on July 26, 1985, and that bid opening was on August 26, 1985. According to the protester, bidders were to complete section B of the solicitation, which consisted of over 20 items identified as "Base Bid Items," "Contingency Items" and "Option Items" and that blank lines for indicating "Unit Price" and "Total Amount" followed each item. At the end of the listed items was a separate line stating "Total Bid" (items 1 through 25), followed with a blank line on which the bidder was to indicate its total bid price. The protester states that after opening the bids and announcing the total bid price submitted by two of the three bidders, the contracting officer stated that the third bidder--Pacific--had not placed a total bid amount on the form. According to Triple A, the contracting officer left the bid room, returned a short time later, and announced that the total price of Pacific's bid was \$1,037,255. By letter dated September 10, 1985, the agency advised Triple A that award had been made to Pacific in the amount of \$575,490.

B-220282

The only ground for protest specifically stated by Triple A is that Pacific's bid should have been rejected as "not responsive" because of that bidder's failure to enter a total price. We disagree.

To be responsive the bid as submitted must represent an unequivocal offer to perform the exact thing required by the solicitation so that acceptance of the bid will bind the contractor to perform in accordance with the solicitation's material terms and conditions. See Olympia USA, Inc., B-216509, Nov. 8, 1984, 84-2 C.P.D. ¶ 513 at 13. We have held that when a bidder entered a bid price for every item, it had, in effect, offered to perform as required under the solicitation. Accordingly, its failure to enter a total price did not render its bid nonresponsive and the failure instead was properly considered as an informality and waived. OTKM Construction Inc., B-219619, Sept. 5, 1985, 64 Comp. Gen. , 85-2 C.P.D. ¶ at 6, 7. In the absence of an indication that Pacific failed to provide a price for any individual item in the bid schedule, its failure to furnish a total bid price was properly for waiver as a minor informality. Thus, the agency properly regarded Pacific's bid as responsive.

The protest is dismissed.

Robert M. Strong Deputy Associate

General Counsel